1	KEVIN V. RYAN (CABN 118321) United States Attorney
2 3	MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549) Chief, Criminal Division
4 5	DEREK R. OWENS (CABN 230237) Special Assistant United States Attorney
6 7	450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-6488 Fax: (415) 436-7234 Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov
8 9	Attorneys for Plaintiff
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13	
14 15	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR No.: 06-00175 MAG
16	Plaintiff,) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
17	v.)
18	MATT TEITELBAUM,)
19	Defendant.))
20	
21	On May 24, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status
22	conference. At that time, the parties stipulated that time should be excluded from the
23 24	Speedy Trial Act calculations from May 24, 2006, through June 28, 2006, for continuity of counsel and for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that
2 4 25	granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of
26	counsel for the Government, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18
20 27	U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by
28	granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant
_	branches saon a community successful the sest interests of the public and the defendant

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order

Case 3:06-cr-00175-JL Document 9 Filed 06/14/06 Page 2 of 2

1 in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). 2 3 SO STIPULATED: KEVIN V. RYAN 4 United States Attorney 5 6 DATED: 6/11/06 DEREK R. OWENS 7 Special Assistant United States Attorney 8 9 DATED: 6/12/06 10 RONALD C. TYLER Attorney for Mr. Teitelbaum 11 12 As the Court found on May 24, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds 13 that an exclusion of time between May 24, 2006, through June 28, 2006, is warranted and 14 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public 15 and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant 16 the requested continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for 17 effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result 18 in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). 19 20 SO ORDERED. 21 'IS SO ORDERED DATED: June 14, 2006 22 Judge Elizabeth D. Laporto 23 24 25 26 27

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order

28